

REMARKS**Introduction**

The present application has been carefully studied and amended in view of the outstanding Office Action dated September 10, 2007, and reconsideration of that Action is requested in view of the following comments.

A petition for a three-month extension of time accompanies this response together with the appropriate fee. Accordingly, the deadline for responding to the Office Action has been extended until March 10, 2008, and this response is therefore timely filed.

Status of claims

Claims 1 to 10 have been examined on the merits. Claims 1 to 4 and 7 to 9 have been rejected. Claims 1 to 10 have been objected to.

Claims 1 and 7 have been currently amended. Claims 4 and 5 have been cancelled. Claims 11 and 12 have been added.

Support for these amendments can be found in the specification as follows:
in claim 1, "said compounds F being selected from the group consisting of 1-(4-hydroxyphenyl)-3-butanone, 2-acetyl-1-ethanol, 3-acetyl-1-propanol, 4-acetyl-1-butanol, and dihydro-5-hydroxymethyl-2(3H)-furanone"

is taken from original claim 5 which now has been cancelled, and is based on page 3, lines 4 to 7, of the specification, with the aldehyde having been deleted, and

in claim 7, the "optionally" clauses have been deleted, and the subject matter of these has been worded as new claims 11 and 12, with the proper dependence on claims 2 and 3,

respectively.

Claim 11 is based on original claim 7, the optional presence of low molar mass polyols **C** being mandatory here, and the dependence has been corrected to claim 2. This is also based on page 3, lines 15 to 25, particularly line 18, of the specification.

Claim 12 is based on original claim 7, the use of a mixture of compounds **E** or compounds **G** or both compounds **E** and compounds **G**, on the one hand, together with compounds **H**, being made mandatory, and the dependence of this claim has been corrected to composition of matter claim 3. This is also based on page 3, line 30, to page 4, line 5, of the specification.

No new matter has therefore been introduced, and entry of the amended claims is respectfully requested as these amended claims clearly put the application into better form for allowance or appeal.

The Office Action

Rejection under 35 U. S. C. 112, second paragraph

It is deemed that by virtue of deleting the language objected to and defining the compounds **F** by their chemical nature, in the way of a Markush group, has rendered moot the objections made under 35 U. S. C. 112, second paragraph, and withdrawal of this reason of rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U. S. C. § 102 (b), or, in the alternative, 103 (a)

Claims 1 to 4 and 7 to 9 have been rejected under 35 U. S. C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by, or in the alternative, under 35 U. S. C. § 103 (a) as being obvious over, the Hobel et al US 2002/0040 093 A1 ("Hobel").

Limitation of claim 1 to those compounds **F** that have been the subject of original claim 5 would make the claims of the present invention allowable, as kindly pointed out in the Official Action under item 7.

As all limitations of claim 5 have now been incorporated into amended claim 1, the dependent claims 2, 3, and 6 to 12 being dependent, directly or indirectly, on this amended claim 1, it is deemed that the amended claim set is now allowable. As the patentability of claims 1 to 3 and 6 to 12 has now been established, allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Based on the foregoing remarks it is believed that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Such action is earnestly sought, and favorable reconsideration is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By Richard M. Beck
Richard M. Beck

Registration No.: 22,580
CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP
1007 North Orange Street; P.O. Box 2207
Wilmington, Delaware 19899
(302) 658-9141; (302) 658-5614 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant

593352